Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

MAILED Paper No.

MATTINGLY & MALUR, P.C. 1800 DIAGONAL ROAD SUITE 370 ALEXANDRIA VA 22314 OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :

Nemoto et al.

Application No. 10/069,732 : DECISION ON PETITION

Patent No. 7,688,685 : PURSUANT TO

Filed: February 26, 2002 : 37 C.F.R. § 1.181

Issued: March 30, 2010 : Attorney Docket No.: ASA-1074 :

Title: MAGNETO-OPTICAL :

RECORDING DEVICE CAPABLE OF : CHANGING THE SHAPES OF HEATING :

AREAS :

BACKGROUND

This is a decision on the petition filed October 8, 2010, requesting that the above-identified patent be accorded a filing date of February 28, 2002.

The application was deposited on February 26, 2002, and a notice of acceptance of application under 35 U.S.C. 371 and 37 CFR 1.494 or 1.495 was mailed on May 2, 2002, indicating that the date of receipt of all 35 U.S.C. 371(c)(1), (c)(2), and (c)(4), and all 35 U.S.C. requirements, was February 26, 2002.

With this petition, Petitioner has asserted that this application was deposited on February 28, 2002. Petitioner has included a date-stamped postcard receipt, which contains a date-stamp from the Office of Initial Patent Examination dated "Feb 28 2002"

Decision on Petition

along with the following pre-printed text: "[f]iled: February 28, 2002."

APPLICABLE PORTION OF THE MPEP

37 CFR 1.181, Petition to the Director, states, in pertinent part:

- (a) Petition may be taken to the Director:
- (1) From any action or requirement of any examiner in the ex parte prosecution of an application, or in ex parte or inter partes prosecution of a reexamination proceeding which is not subject to appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences or to the court;
- (2) In cases in which a statute or the rules specify that the matter is to be determined directly by or reviewed by the Director; and
- (3) To invoke the supervisory authority of the Director in appropriate circumstances. For petitions involving action of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, see § 41.3 of this title.
- (f) The mere filing of a petition will not stay any period for reply that may be running against the application, nor act as a stay of other proceedings. Any petition under this part not filed within two months of the mailing date of the action or notice from which relief is requested may be dismissed as untimely, except as otherwise provided. This two-month period is not extendable.

Emphases added.

ANALYSIS

A review of Office records reveals that the application was prosecuted using February 26, 2002 as the filing date. As such, the Applicant was aware of and accepted the filing date of the application, now U.S. Patent No. 7,688,685, as February 26, 2002. Moreover, the patent issued more than six months before the filing of the present petition, and the public has a right to rely upon the filing date of the application as shown in Office records since February 26, 2002. Finally, Applicant does not assert that the validity of the patent is affected by the filing date of February 26, 2002.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, and no objection having been received within two months of the date of the patent having issued with the filing date of February 26, 2002, the present petition requesting a change in Office records to reflect the filing date of the present patent to February 28, 2002, is dismissed as untimely.

This petition is DISMISSED.

The certificate of correction dated June 8, 2010 is hereby **VACATED**.

The filing date for the application from which this patent issued remains February 26, 2002.

Petitioner may wish to seek either reexamination or reissue as a means of correcting the filing date. Petitioner will note that these avenues are cited merely as a courtesy to Petitioner, and this reference should not be misinterpreted as a commentary on the likelihood of whether or not either avenue would be successful.

Telephone inquiries **regarding this decision** should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3225.

/Paul Shanoski/
Paul Shanoski
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions

¹ Petitioner will note that all practice before the Office should be in writing, and the action of the Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.2. As such, Petitioner is reminded that no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for any further action(s) of Petitioner.